

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 568

CE 015 165

TITLE Service-Learning for the Future. Domestic and International Programs. A Report Prepared for ACTION.

INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Policy Analysis Service.

SPONS AGENCY ACTION, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Jan 78

CONTRACT 76-043-1047

NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; Community Organizations; Community Programs; *Community Service Programs; *Educational Programs; *International Programs; *National Programs; Program Descriptions; *Program Improvement; Service Education; Vocational Education; Work Experience Programs; Work Study Programs; Youth Agencies; *Youth Problems; Youth Programs

IDENTIFIERS American Council on Education

ABSTRACT

Designed to review service learning programs which interrelate the world of education, work, and community service and also to consider what contributions the American Council on Education can make in the areas of education, work, and the problems of American youth, this report discusses various service learning programs, both domestic and international, by explaining how well they function and what can be done to improve each program so that they can play a more effective role in overall youth policy. Part 1 of this two-part report presents descriptions of the following seven domestic programs: the voucher system, the GI Bill, the armed forces, community colleges, HEW/OE programs, ACTION programs, and other public- and private-sector programs. A summary discussion and recommendations conclude the section on domestic programs. Part 2 presents descriptions of the following international programs: college and university programs, intermediary-organization programs, private-sector service-organization programs, public-sector programs, and programs involving a reverse flow. Also included are discussions of the evaluation and assessment of all service-learning experiences, possible courses of action, and recommendations. (BM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED151568

SERVICE-LEARNING FOR THE FUTURE
DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Policy Analysis Service
American Council on Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Report Prepared for ACTION under Contract #76-043-1047

Washington, D.C. • January 1978

OE 015-165

This report was prepared for ACTION under Contract 76-043-1047. This contract states that the contractor will act independently and not under the supervision of any employee of the Federal Government. The views expressed in the report do not necessarily reflect the policies of ACTION.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Foreword	v
 Part One: Domestic Programs	 1
The Voucher System	5
The GI Bill	6
The Armed Forces	8
Community Colleges	9
HEW/OE Programs	10
ACTION Programs	12
Other Public- and Private-Sector Programs	14
Summary and Recommendations	17
 Part Two: International Programs	 22
College and University Programs	23
Intermediary-Organization Programs	29
Private-Sector Service-Organization Programs	31
Public-Sector Programs	32
Programs Involving a Reverse Flow	33
Evaluation and Assessment of Service-Learning Experiences	34
Possible Courses of Action	34
Recommendations	36
Bibliography	38

FOREWORD

On August 5, 1977, President Carter signed into law the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (P.L. 95-93), which provides for several new programs targeted on youth and designed to provide opportunities for work, education, recreation, and community service. Reflecting long-overdue federal recognition of the need for a unified youth policy, this new legislation represents an important advance toward that objective. Nonetheless, much remains to be done if a critical national problem is to be solved.

The lineaments of that problem are familiar but bear retracing. Today's young people have grown up in a society which offers them no clear vision of what they can aspire to, no secure position within its structure, and only limited opportunities for realizing their dreams and hopes.

Most young people today want what young people have always wanted: not a handout, not an easy berth, but a chance to work and to contribute to the fullness of their own and their neighbors' lives. This chance is being denied to many of them. In October 1977, the unemployment rate for 16- to 19-year-olds was 17.3%; among blacks in that age group, it was 37.9%. A quarter of those who enter high school never finish. Those who remain in high school or go on to college are often alienated by a curriculum that is, in the words of James Coleman, "knowledge rich and action poor." A third of those who enroll in community colleges do not return for the second year. Only half of those who enter four-year colleges and universities complete the baccalaureate within four years. The poor tend to give up first because they lack financial resources or because they find the academic experiences available to them inadequate to their needs. But millions

of young people from all backgrounds and income levels drop out--bewildered, frustrated, resentful--only to discover that, without the necessary credentials, they cannot compete for useful careers.

The pathological consequences of this situation for many of our young people are plain: humiliating and then cynical dependency on food stamps and welfare checks, fitful escapes through drugs and alcohol, a frenetic search for kicks and quick money through crime and delinquency, and a brooding hostility toward an adult world that seems to have shut the door in their faces.

The absence of a national youth policy is killing the natural idealism of America's youth, robbing them of any sense of usefulness and purpose, and depriving this country of a vigor and a vision it desperately needs. A more dispiriting beginning to our third century as a nation is hard to conceive.

It does not have to be this way. Surely leaders in government, academe, and private enterprise have enough sensitivity and imagination to devise grass-roots programs of community-service jobs; cooperative community-school arrangements; union, business, and agricultural apprenticeships; adequately funded work-study and college student-aid support; and national conservation activities that can harness the constructive energies of our young people and give them a sense that they are both needed and valued.

As indicated, some steps have already been taken in that direction. P.L. 95-93 holds promise but must, of course, be tested by time. More important, we have already had some experience in this country with service-learning programs, both domestic and international, which interrelate the worlds of education, work, and community service. Just what are these programs, how well do they function, and what can be done to improve them so that they can

play a more effective role in an overall youth policy? This report is designed to answer those questions and, in addition, to consider what contribution the American Council on Education can make to these efforts.

Since its founding in 1918, the American Council has concerned itself not only with higher education per se but also with the place of higher education in the larger society, with the connections between education and the world of work, and with the general problems of American youth. Thus, in 1935, ACE established the American Youth Commission, which, in its six years of operation, produced 35 studies and policy statements, culminating in a final report, Youth and the Future (1942). The conclusions and recommendations in that report seem almost as relevant today as they did a quarter century ago.

Further ACE has established both a Commission and an Office on Educational Credit (formerly called Accreditation of Service Experiences), concerned with credit and credentialing policies and practices in postsecondary education, with special reference to learning that occurs outside the sponsorship of chartered or licensed educational institutions.

Still more recently, ACE's Policy Analysis Service has turned its attention to the articulation between education and work and to the development of a national youth policy. (See the PAS publication Policy Briefs, November 1977.) In February 1976, PAS hosted a seminar which took as its point of departure The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education/Work Policy (1975), by Willard Wirtz and the National Manpower Institute. The participants examined the dysfunction between schooling and jobs in American society and discussed the feasibility of establishing community-based

Education-Work Councils as proposed by Mr. Wirtz. (A report of that seminar is available through the ERIC system: ED 128 599.)

In addition, PAS commissioned a paper, New Prospects for Youth: Worlds of Education, Work, and Service, by Dennis Gallagher of the National Manpower Institute, surveying opportunities for young people in all three of these areas and making recommendations designed to further the formulation of a national youth policy. That paper, along with the two parts of this report, provided the basis for a seminar in December 1976 that brought together representatives of various public and private agencies concerned with youth programs.

Under a contract with ACTION, the federal volunteer agency, the present report was prepared for PAS by outside consultants. Robert Gilkey was responsible for researching and drafting the first part, on domestic service-learning; he was assisted in the early stages of research by Paul Buchanan and Betsy Downes. Robert F. Stephens and Carol E. Martin were responsible for the second part, on international service-learning. Kevin-John H. McIntyre condensed and reworked the earlier drafts. Laura Kent of the PAS staff did the final editing. Thomas M. Corwin, Policy Analyst, and John F. Hughes, Director of PAS, coordinated the entire project. Finally, invaluable support was given by Donald Eberly, ACTION's Senior Policy Analyst.

December 20, 1977

Stephen K. Bailey
Special Advisor to the President
American Council on Education

PART ONE: DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

The time is ripe for serious consideration of service-learning programs. First, the current "crisis" in American education has made imperative the search for alternative learning structures; second, various types of service-learning programs have been in existence long enough to permit evaluation of their potential for alleviating some aspects of that crisis.

The much-abused term crisis does not refer to any one problem but to a whole complex of symptoms with many different social, economic, structural, demographic, political, and institutional causes. These symptoms have developed both within and outside of our educational institutions, which by their very nature are slow to respond to the changing circumstances under which they operate. Such circumstances affect both their goals and their ability to achieve those goals.

While quick to acknowledge that education does not take place in a vacuum, educational policy-makers too often ignore this obvious fact and settle for little more than incremental change in the status quo. As a consequence of this narrow and short-sighted attitude, the nation's educational institutions have laid themselves open to charges of irrelevance, insensitivity, and incompetence. Only reluctantly have they come to recognize their social responsibilities in a democratic society.

Higher education, in particular, tends to view its responsibilities as essentially academic rather than social. Postsecondary educators and administrators see the crisis in education as the concern of the elementary, secondary, and vocational schools; they see the broader social context as the concern of economists, political scientists, legislators, and social agencies. Insulated by their departmentalized institutions, they view as remote such problems as youth unemployment, the difficulties of the school-to-work transition,

the educational and social disadvantages of minority students, the needs of the outside community, and the limited relevance of classroom learning to experience in the "real world." Their perspective is constrained by an academic bias which--while legitimate, appropriate, and important--must be broadened to comprehend the need for an adequate institutional response to those aspects of the crisis which most deeply affect them

Increasingly, educators and others concerned with the related problems of health, employment, and public welfare have sought ways to reorganize and improve social services. Until recently, they believed that the main problem was underfinancing. They thought that too much was spent on the private sector and that directing more resources into the public sector--for example, federal aid to education--would produce the desired results. But we know now that money by itself is not enough. The average American is probably getting better education, health care, and social services than his parents did; yet dissatisfaction with social services runs high.

Much of the dissatisfaction centers on the fragmentation and obvious ineffectiveness of training programs, job placement, urban renewal, and other social services for the poor. But dissatisfaction is not confined to the poor. Many students believe that colleges and universities are not equipped to educate them for life. Many educators agree and insist that the system be reorganized to serve more effectively not only students but also the supporting community, rich and poor, young and old.

Significant efforts have been made to address this complex of problems. Many of these efforts involve the concept of service-learning, which attempts to deal simultaneously with an array of educational and other social problems at points where they would seem to mesh most naturally. Ideally, service-learning programs

combine off-campus learning with some kind of volunteer community service for which the student receives compensation in the form of academic credit, educational vouchers, financial assistance, or a combination of all three.

Well-known examples of service-learning and other work-education programs include cooperative education, private-enterprise training programs, the armed forces, and community colleges.

A variety of classifications and criteria have been proposed for comparing and evaluating the various types of service-learning programs. Probably the most systematic are those offered by Alice M. Rivlin and by Martin Trow.

Criteria similar to at least some of those proposed by Rivlin were incorporated initially in the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning (CAEL), a project funded by the Ford Foundation and conducted by the Educational Testing Service (Princeton, New Jersey) in cooperation with a consortium of colleges and universities. Specialists in various fields were to assess experiential learning programs, much as ACE's Office on Educational Credit does in its guides to courses offered by the armed forces and other noncollegiate institutions. CAEL was also to assess various learning experiences on the basis of individual profiles and other detailed information including, ideally, a longitudinal data system. It appears, however, that CAEL has all but abandoned the application of these criteria, not to mention others suggested by Rivlin and other authorities, and now plans to rely almost entirely upon the expert opinion of specialists.

Unfortunately, the problem with all these evaluative criteria is that they are complex, confusing, ambiguous, and expensive to apply. Worse, they are incapable of indicating definitively which programs are well designed and well managed, which are effective now, and which are likely to be effective in the future. Despite

these limitations, they do offer some guidance in evaluating service-learning programs. Almost all the evaluations made to date come down to three major conclusions:

1. The consensus among educators is that this nation needs a coherent youth policy. This opinion is widely shared by economists and others who have begun to show an interest in the relations between education, work, and other areas of society.

2. Most of the programs currently available are small in terms of the amount of money and the number of participants involved; in the case of the few larger programs that exist, the service-learning component is small. Nonetheless, as "demonstration" programs, they have deservedly attracted considerable attention; indeed, many proponents and even some critics have been moved to reconsider a far more ambitious proposal that, in one form or another, has been discussed for years: a "universal" or national youth service, which, in most versions, would be a kind of civilian counterpart to military service, voluntary or compulsory, with educational vouchers and financial subsidies similar to those now provided by the GI Bill.

3. To be effective, any service-learning program on whatever scale must satisfy the requirements both for a legitimate learning experience and for a valid concept of service. That is, it must be worthy of receiving academic credit, and it cannot be merely subsidized make-work but must meet real community needs and merit remuneration. It should be voluntary and attractive to a large number of young people on a broad economic, social, and educational spectrum.

With these general conclusions in mind, we will turn now for a brief critical look at each of the existing service-learning models and demonstration programs with potential for expansion. The discussion covers the following: (1) the voucher system, (2) the GI Bill, (3) the armed forces, (4) the community colleges, (5) HEW/OE

programs, (6) ACTION programs, and (7) other public- and private-sector programs. The first part of this report closes with a summary and recommendations pertaining to domestic service-learning programs.

The Voucher System

Not only is the voucher system the most radical form of educational decentralization examined by Rivlin and others, but also it provides perhaps the clearest evidence of how service-learning programs in secondary schools differ from those in postsecondary institutions. For though the voucher concept has worked well under the GI Bill in higher education, it has been resisted by the secondary schools for several reasons.

One serious objection to the voucher system is that it would simply aggravate existing problems of income inequality, since middle-class parents already spend more than poor parents do on their children's education. Giving larger vouchers to poor children, as some have proposed, would not solve the problem unless at the same time higher-income families were prohibited from spending any additional funds on their children's education, and that step is obviously unacceptable politically.

Another major problem with the voucher system is consumer ignorance. Parents cannot normally afford the time and expense of shopping around, let alone of moving a child from one school to another until they find one they like, without endangering the child's educational and social progress. Moreover, even educated parents have difficulty judging whether their child is progressing as rapidly as possible in school. How, then, can less educated, poor parents even begin to exercise accurate consumer judgment unless and until better performance measures are developed to

enable them to choose more intelligently? Unfortunately for the purposes of this report, none of the voucher experiments conducted in the secondary schools by the Office of Economic Opportunity seems to have included a service-learning component. As is noted below, however, ACTION has had some success in combining the voucher and service-learning concepts in its Program for Local Service (PLS).

The GI Bill

It is unfortunate that neither Rivlin nor Coleman and his associates discuss the voucher system in higher education, where "natural experiments" with the GI Bill would seem to have demonstrated that the "market model," with or without a service-learning component, works better than in secondary education. For one thing, the vouchers are not free but earned. For another thing, the consumers are no longer the parents but the grown-up children or young adults who are not so ignorant as consumers and are less daunted by the prospect of choosing among different kinds of programs offered by different kinds of postsecondary institutions.

The GI Bill has been recognized as one of the best economic as well as educational investments ever made by the nation. Although one of the original reasons for the bill was to keep veterans from flooding the labor market and thus raising the unemployment rate, its success was subsequently justified by far more important economic criteria; namely, a return on investment of several times the \$15 billion spent between 1945 and 1954 on education and training. No study has been made of the GI Bill as an investment because, according to an official of the Veterans Administration quoted by Eberly, it might appear that the VA was trying to make a case for a "universal GI Bill." One Pennsylvania

state official estimated that between 1946 and 1973 the GI Bill had yielded a sixteenfold return solely in terms of increased federal tax payments, not to mention other noneconomic returns to the individual and society.

According to the Second Newman Report, the GI Bill had several results beyond its original purpose and beyond the expectations of most observers: (1) Returning veterans proved to be more highly motivated and competent students than traditional undergraduates, thus helping to create a learning environment that was beneficial to their younger classmates; (2) the idea that education benefits are an appropriate additional compensation for service to the country came to be widely accepted; and (3) the idea that the "common man" can benefit from college was confirmed.

The Second Newman Report goes on to point out that, despite its proven effectiveness, nothing has been done to extend the concept of the GI Bill beyond the military service. Yet the changes that have taken place in higher education and in society as a whole make such an effort more urgent than ever before. The Task Force therefore recommends:

. . . new federal legislation, a "GI Bill for Community Service," designed to legitimate breaking the educational lockstep for a period of service in selected national, regional, or local community programs. The benefits, like those of the GI Bill, would accrue during the period of service and could be used later whenever the volunteer chose to enroll at a postsecondary educational institution. This program would supplement existing federal student assistance, and extend the concept of service, in addition to need and academic ability, as a legitimate basis for the award of federal student aid. (Newman et al., 1973, p. 105)

The Armed Forces

As Morris Janowitz points out, today's military establishment "by the single measure of educational attainment of its members, is in advance of many other sectors of institutional life." For example, it has moved further than most industrial sectors in bringing personnel up into the middle class from the unskilled lower class. Moreover, it does so largely without regard to race: "The armed forces have gone further than any other institutional sector in incorporating and upgrading Negro personnel." Thus the armed forces provide what Etzioni calls a "sociological mix" that is ideal for service-learning.

In both war and peace, the military inevitably gets involved in community development problems with civilian institutions.

Since World War II the revolution in military technology has brought about important changes in the profession, especially in educational procedures. For one thing, the huge peacetime military establishment requires more officers than the service academies can supply, even when reinforced by ROTC programs in civilian institutions. Therefore, the military establishment has had to set up virtually its own educational system in order to professionalize officer candidates recruited from civilian life as well as to retrain officers and enlisted personnel in the latest technologies. The proliferation of such programs inevitably has led to problems of equivalency and accreditation with civilian institutions; hence the creation of ACE's Office on Educational Credit and its Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services (1976).

Community Colleges

Today's community colleges bear little resemblance to the traditional junior college, and nowhere is this dissimilarity more striking than in degree of commitment to local public-service programs.

Among the 1,200 two-year colleges that exist today, most are publicly supported, autonomous institutions governed by local boards. They offer two tracks: one leading to further education and transfer to four-year institutions, the other to employment through vocational training. Both tracks offer students the opportunity to participate in an increasing variety of service-learning, work-study, and other public-service programs. Moreover, students and faculty participate in many community-related activities that are peripheral to training or teaching, such as determining local occupational demands, projecting future social needs, and acting as a central or liaison agency for social services. Such, in brief, is the ideal function of the community college as described, for example, by Gleazer and others in a special issue of Synergist (Spring 1975), a journal published by ACTION's National Student Volunteer Program.

Some 3.5 million students now attend the nation's 1,200 two-year colleges. The average community college student is older--over 25--than the traditional college student, is married, and has a family. Ten years ago most students chose the academic or transfer rather than the vocational program, although few persisted in academic studies, completed their course, and actually transferred. Community college students now constitute about half of the approximately 500,000 postsecondary students who transfer annually to four-year colleges. But a growing majority are choosing the vocational program, partly because of high youth unemployment and

partly because of the far greater variety of courses offered in the vocational program--something for practically everyone.

HEW/OE Programs

Federal aid to education has sometimes followed, sometimes led, local communities in their effort to prepare youth for employment. This historical development has taken place roughly in three stages. The first involved vocational training: Federal support was first given to vocational-technical training schools and land-grant universities to help working-class and rural youth find employment in the cities and on the farms; the independent church-sponsored liberal arts colleges in the small towns took care of middle-class youth. The second stage involved cooperative education: Federal support was given to those liberal arts institutions which had programs to interrupt, alternatively or simultaneously, the traditional four-year program with periods of work arranged in cooperation with local businesses and industries. The third stage involved service-learning (or "integrative") programs: Federal support was given to those institutions with programs for integrating education and employment by providing academic credit for off-campus community service.

Most federal programs in the first two categories are sponsored by HEW's Office of Education; most of those in the last are currently the responsibility of ACTION.

Financially, there is no comparison. Whereas the ACTION programs have only modest budgets, OE's various vocational and adult education programs cost nearly \$1 billion annually, most in the form of grants to states. The College Work-Study program alone costs nearly \$400 million. The Cooperative Education and the Community Service and Continuing Education programs spend about \$10

million and \$12 million, respectively. Of the OE programs, the most interesting for their service-learning potential are Cooperative Education, Career Education, and the College Work-Study Program (CWSP).

If, as seems likely, the Career Education program can overcome the handicap of being associated with traditional vocational and adult education, then it may indeed actually become a service-learning program, at least in its so-called experience-based model.

Like Career Education, the Cooperative Education program grew out of vocational and adult education, but much earlier, and through local efforts rather than as an offspring of the U.S. Office of Education. As noted earlier, OE now supports nearly 1,000 postsecondary institutions offering cooperative programs. In theory at least, OE's Cooperative Education program should mesh or overlap with ACTION's University Year, Youth Challenge Program, and National Student Volunteer Program. Consider this official statement of Cooperative Education's program goals and objectives:

The purpose of this program is to assist some institutions of higher education in establishing, strengthening or expanding their campuses' Cooperative Education programs which alternate full-time academic study with periods of full-time employment. The purpose of such student employment is to enable students to obtain funds for their education and to the extent possible work experience related to their academic or occupational objectives.

The College Work-Study Program has goals and objectives similar to those of Cooperative Education, with several very important differences: Cooperative Education grants are used by institutions to help students find off-campus jobs, whereas CWS grants are used to pay students to work, mostly in on-campus jobs. Thus, CWSP is an indirect federal subsidy to the institution.

Attempts to persuade postsecondary institutions to promote a

higher proportion of off-campus jobs have understandably been resisted on the ground of financial need. Most institutions also rightfully claim to lack the capability to place students in the public and non-profit sectors. Created partly to overcome this problem, the Urban Corps was developed first by New York City to place students off campus, particularly with city agencies. Today, there are across the country some 70 Urban Corps offices, which place about 15,000 students annually.

Encouraged by the success of the Urban Corps, Congressman James H. Scheuer, also of New York City, sponsored legislation to establish an off-campus work-study program. This act was passed but never funded, primarily because still other congressmen from New York and other large cities opposed the expenditure of public funds to pay students, instead of unemployed adults, even for part-time community service work.

The dilemma is a real one and perhaps easier to resolve in theory than practice: namely, by matching the qualified persons to the job, whether student or unemployed adult, either of whom could be eligible to receive financial assistance, academic credit, or vouchers. But the Work-Study program was not set up to handle such variables, nor were most other programs with a service-learning potential.

ACTION Programs

Requested by President Kennedy in 1962 "to study the feasibility of a national service program patterned after the Peace Corps," a prestigious committee came up with a proposal which led to VISTA, or Volunteers in Service to America. Basically an anti-poverty program, it serves the poor, the Indian, the migrant worker; and its service-learning component is more potential than actual:

Volunteers work under the sponsorship of local organizations, but normally no provision is made for "experiential" education (that is, academic credit arranged in advance).

As with most of its other programs, ACTION typically recruits, trains, and dispatches VISTA volunteers to project sites. As in the Peace Corps, each VISTA volunteer is provided with a minimal living allowance of about \$3,000 a year, plus a vacation allowance, medical insurance, and a reserve stipend of \$50 monthly which is remitted at the end of service.

Although it is by far the largest and best known of ACTION programs after the Peace Corps, VISTA currently has only about 4,500 volunteers and has never exceeded 5,000, as compared with the Peace Corps, which currently enrolls 6,880 (down from 15,500 in 1968). The VISTA volunteer must be over 18 and possess a skill requested by the sponsor. Because sponsors prefer professionally trained community workers, teachers, and administrators to undergraduates, the average age of volunteers has tended to rise over the years, and today fewer than half are between 18 and 24 years of age.

According to Eberly, VISTA has changed during the twelve years of its existence in at least two important ways: first, whereas all volunteers were originally recruited nationally and served away from home, today more than half come from the communities where they serve; second, about half of these locally recruited VISTA volunteers are themselves in the low-income group. The possibility of arranging academic credit at the university level, suggested in the original plan, has yet to be actualized, however, for that half of the volunteer group who presumably need it most, the undergraduates.

To make up for these limitations by providing academic credit for full-time community service the University Year for ACTION (UYA) was started in 1971 as a VISTA offshoot. It embodies four goals:

(1) providing competent workers for poverty programs, (2) encouraging educational institutions to assist local communities, (3) combining community services and academic study, and (4) decentralizing volunteer programs at the local level through academic institutions.

Colleges and universities receive federal grants to select, train, and supervise UYA volunteers, who work for one year at full-time jobs with community agencies organized to solve poverty problems; the average stipend is \$3,000. The student volunteer normally lives and works with the people in the community that the agency serves and meanwhile receives academic credit toward a degree.

As a demonstration program, UYA seems so far to have succeeded out of all proportion to its small size (only about 2,000 students annually at 50 institutions). In the period since its founding in 1972, ACTION has spent \$35 million on community service-learning programs, of which 94% went to UYA. Has this money been well spent? The answer is a qualified yes, according to McKee and Gaffney, Sexton and Stephenson, and others. In any case, UYA seems definitely to have taken root and become "institutionalized" in the world of higher education, especially in community colleges and state land-grant universities.

A more recent demonstration program is the Youth Challenge Program (YC), initiated in 1975 to encourage high school as well as college students aged 14-21 to participate in part-time service-learning projects. Student volunteers work part time for a period of one year or less. No compensation is paid unless separate arrangements are made to compensate participants from other sources, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps. In 1975 about 2,000 students participated in programs at some 19 high schools and colleges, which received grants totaling \$250,000. One great attraction of this

program is that it introduces students to the idea of service-learning, thereby encouraging them to volunteer later for a full-time program.

This function is also being fulfilled by an older ACTION program, the National Student Volunteer Program (NSVP), which began in 1969 with the purpose of providing "technical assistance" to existing student volunteer programs on about 1,000 college campuses. Today, there are about 450,000 student volunteers at nearly 2,000 colleges and 500 high schools. The annual cost of this support program is only about \$325,000 because, unlike the previously described ACTION programs, neither the educational institutions nor the students receive any direct financial support; nor does ACTION have any authority over local programs.

Instead, the NSVP provides three kinds of services:

(1) technical assistance materials including basic "how to" manuals, program kits containing case studies of other service-learning projects, an academic credit kit, a funding kit, directories of student volunteer programs, and the excellent journal, Synergist published three times during the school year; (2) training sessions for professional directors and advisors of student volunteer programs, held periodically during the school year to develop job skills in creating and managing student volunteer programs; (3) on-site consultation, provided to programs that need direct assistance and to groups sponsoring conferences or workshops on various aspects of student volunteer programs.

Each local independent college and high school determines its own program goals and activities in accordance with the needs of the local community and the interests and abilities of the student volunteers themselves. Such activities include work with young children and with the elderly, drug abuse prevention, tutoring,

companionship and recreation projects, consumer education, and housing improvement.

Though not designed as a service-learning program, the Program for Local Service (PLS) merits attention here. The PLS was begun in the Seattle area in 1973 as an experiment to test the concept of national service for young people. The volunteers, who range from age 18 to 25, serve for one year, working full time on community projects and being paid at 90% of the minimum wage. Local initiatives are preserved: The sponsoring agencies consist of local public or private-nonprofit organizations; they, together with the applicants, complete agreement forms specifying what jobs should be done. No quotas are mandated: The agencies are free to select those young people whom they believe to be most qualified for the job. More will be said about this program later, since it may be the best overall demonstration model for a National Youth Service.

Other Public- and Private-Sector Programs

None of the other programs in the public or private sectors is directly relevant to service-learning in higher education. The Urban Corps, as mentioned, has been helpful in placing college work-study students in off-campus jobs. Each year, the now-defunct Neighborhood Youth Corps and subsequent youth programs funded under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) have found part-time jobs for nearly one million young people between the ages of 14 and 22 (some of them from ACTION's Youth Challenge Program), but the jobs have often been make-work projects during the summer. The Job Corps currently enrolls some 43,000 underprivileged youth aged 16-21 and plans to expand to 88,000. It encourages participants to work toward the equivalent of a high school diploma. The program has a drop-out rate of more than 50%; but of those who com-

plete the program, 90% or more find employment, thanks largely to the assistance of Women in Community Service and the Joint Action for Community Service.

As already noted, many local businesses and major corporations, such as General Motors, have for some time shown a sense of enlightened self-interest in conducting educational and training programs, independently or under the auspices of the Cooperative Education Program. Workers get training on or off the job, local science teachers are brought up to date in the latest technologies, student counselors and administrators attend seminars on career education. Such programs continue to expand at a rapid rate, assisted by such professional organizations as the National Alliance of Businessmen, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Junior League, all of which emphasize community service as well as technical training and vocational guidance.

Even the armed forces--which, as we have noted, have enormous potential for service-learning at both the secondary and postsecondary levels--are interested not only in training recruits in technical skills but also in educating them for the return to civilian life. The higher education community has shown strong interest in setting standards for the accreditation of courses offered by the armed forces as well as by private corporations and other organizations. As already noted, ACE's Office on Educational Credit has published several guides to such courses; and the General Educational Development (GED) Testing Program and College-Level Examination Program (CLEP) are well known.

Summary and Recommendations

If we grant the depth and breadth of both the crisis in education and the crisis facing young people in America today, some form

of "universal" national youth policy seems both necessary and advisable. As the foregoing review makes obvious, however, there is no one simple formula or model for a national program. The service-learning concept seems the most promising, but the young are not a homogeneous group and so cannot be served by any single program. A national service-learning program, therefore, should be part of a more broadly conceived National Youth Service Program.

As noted earlier, any such national program must be voluntary and attractive to young people across a wide socioeconomic spectrum. As a service program, it must meet real community needs; and where integrated with formal education, it must live up to legitimate academic standards.

What emerges from the brief overview sketched in this report are two separate but closely related areas of concern:

1. Some way must be found to expand service-learning demonstration programs to the national scale without losing the advantages of decentralization and of sensitivity to the real needs of young people and of communities; the service component of a national program must be suitable for all young people: advantaged and disadvantaged, student and nonstudent alike; and

2. Where service is to be part of a formal learning experience involving a postsecondary educational institution, the relation must be looked at from the individual institution's point of view as well as from the larger national programmatic point of view.

Exploring each of these areas in turn will help to clarify the rationale for recommending a universal National Youth Service as an appropriate response to the youth crisis and the related crisis in education. Though none of the domestic programs described in this report is by itself a perfect model, the major components of each

are not inconsistent. Thus, a GI-Bill-type model could provide vouchers to be used at community colleges and could also give credit for military courses.

ACTION's Program for Local Service (PLS) is probably the best overall demonstration model for a National Youth Service. While emphasizing the service component, it does not preclude fuller development of the learning component. If funded at a level comparable to that for the GI Bill, PLS could reach a much larger audience. The cost would be justified on a number of counts: the value of the services rendered; the educational return to the participants and to society as a whole; the savings in unemployment payments, law enforcement costs, and other social costs connected with the current youth crisis.

The composition of a national service program would probably be similar to that for the PLS. Eberly sketches a profile of PLS participants:

. . . the male-female ratio was 2:3. The participants were poorer than average, but also a little better educated. Minority young people enrolled in PLS at a rate of 50% higher than their proportion of the population. Seven out of ten participants were unemployed and looking for work. One in four received academic credit linked to the learning acquired from service with PLS.

Unlike national service, PLS did not offer conservation activities. Had these been available, one would have expected the male-female ratio to approach unity and the average educational level to drop slightly. (Eberly, 1977, p. 449)

An expanded PLS would serve two functions: (1) it would provide community service opportunities at the local level, and (2) it would recruit and place young people interested in working on conservation or community service projects. Given sufficient

funding--along with the necessary cooperation between ACTION and the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Labor--such a service program could guarantee places for all interested young people.

The second area of concern with respect to a National Youth Service is the awarding of postsecondary academic credit for learning connected with the service experience. The University Year for Action (UYA) is probably the best model for this aspect of such a program. As was pointed out earlier, UYA volunteers serve for one year, working full time at a community agency; for the learning thus acquired, they receive a full year's academic credit. According both to anecdotal accounts and to assessments by professional evaluators, UYA has been generally successful as a service-learning program. Nine in ten of those who had participated in the program said that they learned more of a practical nature during their year in UYA than during a regular college year; over half said they had gained more cognitively. In addition,

. . . Poor people have received needed services. The government has paid for the delivery of these services and, in doing so, assisted in the education of students. The students have acquired learning, received subsistence payment, gained work experience, and enjoyed the satisfaction of helping others.

. . . UYA has often helped bring [the universities] closer to the surrounding community and is viewed as being helpful in recruiting students. Also, UYA has helped them become more flexible and imaginative in the award of academic credit. (Eberly, 1977, pp. 55-56).

While service-learning curricula and programs like UYA are becoming more prevalent, most get too little support from postsecondary institutions. Colleges and universities must take the initiative not only in developing outreach into the community but also in assuring that service-learning programs are adequately

funded from tuition and fees and that they provide faculty supervision, full-time program administration, and academic credit. Finally, the Federal government must get involved through some GI-Bill-type legislation.

If a National Youth Service program with a service-learning component were introduced, it would go very far indeed toward addressing the crises which currently plague the nation's young people and which have such profound consequences for education in America.

PART TWO: INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

International programs have become common on U.S. campuses. Almost every college in the nation offers some form of study-abroad program to its students, often through linkages with another college's overseas program. The Institute of International Education (IIE) lists some 670 programs that involve study abroad. Though no one can say precisely how many American students go abroad in a year, several years ago the IIE estimated the number of full-time students overseas to be about 60,000.

Even so, since World War II, in-migration to the United States for educational purposes has far exceeded out-migration. According to IIE, the foreign student population has more than doubled since 1962. Open Doors 1975 reported 154,580 foreign students registered in U.S. colleges and universities during 1974-75, as against 74,814 in 1962-63.

Perhaps partly as a result of the tremendous impact of the Peace Corps, many more young people are choosing service and work experience overseas. The Council on International Educational Exchange has estimated that as many as 30,000 U.S. students go abroad each year to work, and many more might do so if information about opportunities and contacts were more readily available. A needs analysis of international studies and programs revealed that students set high priority on international work experiences. The three most frequent requests were for (1) an affiliation with an international organization for student summer work exchange; (2) a handbook on international work experiences; and (3) an informational meeting on work experiences abroad.

More recently, Representative J. Joseph Moakley of Massachusetts introduced legislation to encourage college and university international programs that give students practical experience and to provide financial assistance and internships for participating students.

Despite this evidence of increased interest, the number of study-abroad programs available to students on American campuses actually declined by 23% in the two-year period 1972-1974, chiefly because of rising costs, though political unrest in some countries was a contributing factor.

This report examines the concept of international service-learning. The types of programs that currently exist in the United States are described, as are efforts to institute a reverse flow. In addition, techniques to evaluate experiential programs are examined. Finally, possible courses of action are outlined, and recommendations presented.

International service learning is defined here as any structured work and experiential learning program conducted in a multi-cultural/multinational milieu in the interests of the recipient people. Participants in such a program join of their own free will and work for a specified period for the benefit of others, with little or no remuneration. This definition is three-dimensional, giving equal weight to service, work, and learning components.

A recently completed survey shows that approximately 30 colleges have what could be generally described as service-learning programs overseas. Thus, slightly fewer than 5% of the 670 study-abroad programs listed by the IIE involve service-learning. These programs fall into four general categories, according to their sponsorship: college and university programs, intermediary-organization programs, private-sector service-organization programs, and public-sector programs.

College and University Programs

Most college and university international service-learning programs have been developed at small liberal arts colleges. These

programs range from highly developed, comprehensive programs to loosely structured and more limited internship programs.

Full International Service-Learning Programs

Of this first group, Goshen College (Goshen, Indiana) offers the most comprehensive and fully integrated service-learning program, known as the Study-Service Trimester. The program is unique in that Goshen is the only college to send virtually all its students abroad, to nations with significantly different cultures, where they spend a normal term of education that includes both study and service work.

Inaugurated in 1968 (though Goshen had experimented with study-service arrangements since 1963), the Study-Service Trimester is offered as part of the student's general education and, if successfully completed, counts for 12 semester hours of credit. The trimester is divided into two parts, both of which take place abroad. The first half involves study of the country (to help the student understand the culture on its own terms) and of the language of the country (to give the student at least some proficiency in reading and speaking). The language department on campus is responsible for structuring the language program and evaluating the student's performance. Nationals lecture in English (or in their own language, with translation) on a wide range of topics: the country's plant and animal life, history, geography, government, industrial development, educational system, relations with the U.S. Students travel to points of interest related to the lectures.

During the second half of the trimester, students are assigned to field locations for service work without salary. Jobs include doing manual labor, teaching English, engaging in apprentice-type work with a government agency, assisting with a mission program,

working as a nurse's aide in a modern hospital, and helping at a remote rural clinic.

As an essential part of the program, each student lives in the home of a national and takes at least two meals a day with his or her "family." A regular member of the college, accompanied by spouse and family, is on location, normally for at least a year, to administer the program. They give guidance to the students, arrange for the lecturers and language teachers, maintain an adequate library, make reading assignments, and give tests. During the study half of the trimester, the student stays in or near a large city, usually the capital, where the faculty couple maintains headquarters. During the service half, the student often lives with a second family, frequently many hours from the capital city.

Normally, any given location accommodates three groups of 15-25 students each year. The terms are from September to December, from January to April, and from May to August. The following countries have hosted groups: Costa Rica, Guadeloupe, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Belize, Germany, Poland, and South Korea.

For those locations within the Central America-Caribbean region, the trimester abroad costs the student the same as a trimester in residence on campus--one reason why such a large percentage of the students choose to do the Study-Service Trimester abroad. Students choosing countries not in the Central America-Caribbean region pay slightly more because of greater travel costs. The college remunerates the people assisting in the program and the hosts in whose homes the students stay.

The Goshen College Study-Service Trimester is highly developed and strongly supported. Three aspects of the program deserve

special emphasis. First, its continuity is assured by the three consecutive groups of students and the resident faculty couple. Second, good administration and effective communication between the groups and Goshen College also result from the existence of the resident faculty couple. Third, complete accessibility to the program is guaranteed because the college arranges for the program to cost no more than a trimester on campus.

Another project that should be mentioned here is the School for International Training, Experiment in International Living, which offers four major programs: the Master of Arts in Teaching, International Career Training, the World Issues Program, and International Students of English. The first three are relevant to our survey of international service-learning programs.

Combination Service-Learning Programs

The second group within the category of college- and university-sponsored programs are the combination service-learning programs. These programs are based on the service-learning rationale but are more developed domestically than internationally.

Merrill College, of the University of California at Santa Cruz offers the Field Study Program, which places and supervises students in a variety of off-campus projects. The program is predicated on the assumption that people learn through active experience as well as through formal course work. Credit is given for almost all field study.

Beliot College in Wisconsin, an independent nonsectarian liberal arts college, has since 1964 required its degree-credit students to take a Field Term of work and service, off campus and away from home. A Field Term is defined as "an approved work experience in business, education, government service, or social service." Each placement is worked out individually in light of the student's interests, talents,

and experiences. The majority of the placements are in the United States, but about 20% are abroad. Students have been placed in Western Europe, Africa, Latin America, and Japan. The Field Term usually lasts about four months. It carries no credit but is a requirement for graduation.

Other programs on a smaller scale in terms of "international" studies are located at Goddard College (Vermont), Antioch College (Ohio), Earlham College (Indiana), Iowa Wesleyan College, Friends World College (New York), Marymount College (New York), and the United States International University (California).

Special-Interest Service-Learning Programs

The third group of college and university programs are those which concentrate on one geographical area or one discipline.

In the fall semester of 1975, California State University at Chico established the Morelia Program in Mexico, modeled loosely after the Goshen College Study-Service Trimester. A group of approximately 25 students undergo intensive instruction for ten weeks, studying geography, art, and Spanish. At the completion of the ten weeks, they retire from all their courses to receive full or partial credit. The final 5 1/2 weeks of the semester are spent working and living in Morelia, Mexico.

The service experiences are arranged by a faculty coordinator with the help of the Morelia Chamber of Commerce. Activities include assisting nurses for the Red Cross, teaching English at a boys' reformatory, writing English and Spanish guides for museums, planning programs at a home for senior citizens, and supervising recreation activities at an orphanage.

The students are evaluated on the basis of journals and essay

tests treating social, geographical, and psychological issues of the Mexican people and culture.

The cost of the program for the student includes tuition for 15 units of credit for one semester, the costs of subsistence in Morelia for five weeks, and transportation to and from Morelia. The students live with Mexican families, who are paid a small sum to cover expenses.

Rockland Community College (Suffern, New York) is the leader of a small but growing number of community colleges which recognize the importance of international education. Its extensive Israel program has well-developed arrangements for service-learning experiences. As an alternative to formal institutions, Rockland places students in informal educational settings which unite education and work. Since 1972, Rockland has been affiliated with the following programs: Kibbutz Ulpan Program, Kibbutz University Semester, Oranim Kibbutz Teacher's College, Habonim Workshop, Givat Haviva (Hashomer Ha Tzair), and Beit Berl (Kefar Saba).

In addition to these informal programs, Rockland counselors are prepared to write "learning contracts" for those students who would benefit most from individually designed programs combining study and service-oriented work. Students are evaluated by Rockland counselors and by representatives of the affiliated programs. At the end of the program in Israel, the student receives a transcript from Rockland reflecting the type of experience which was completed.

The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University (Medford, Massachusetts) offers two specialized programs--the Latin American Teaching Fellowships program and the Asia/Pacific Teaching Fellowships program--which provide university-level teaching to Latin American and Asian institutions. The programs have been supported financially by the State Department's Bureau of Educational

and Cultural Affairs (currently being reorganized) under the authority of the Fulbright-Hays Act and by major foundations, universities, and corporations in the United States, Canada, Latin America, and Asia/Pacific. All Fellows must have at least a master's degree. They normally serve for 24 months and receive a salary but no academic credit.

In 1972, Meharry Medical College (Nashville, Tennessee) established the Maternal and Child Health/Family Planning, Training, and Research Center, whose major training function is to provide course work and field experience for both African and American public health personnel so that they can assist in developing and introducing integrated maternal- and child-health and family-planning services in African countries.

Intermediary-Organization Programs

These programs serve as bridges to connect interested students with international service-learning experiences. They fall into two groups: multipurpose service-learning programs and more narrowly focused programs.

Multipurpose Programs

The College Venture Program Abroad of the Institute for Off-Campus Experience, Northeastern University (Boston, Massachusetts) is a multipurpose service-learning program which arranges for students from the 16 institutions that are currently members of the program to take a leave from their home campuses and spend from three months to a year working in a job or participating in service experiences overseas. In addition to arranging work experiences overseas, the College Venture Program Abroad and the Experiment in International Living have in the past sponsored four international service-learning programs. The first, the Professional Service Program, allows students

to work with professional companies in the host country and to live with a family. The second, Teaching English as a Second Language, begins with an intensive four-week course in the methodology of teaching English as a foreign language, orientation, and language training; students spend one month with a host family, and the remainder of the time teaching English in an institution. The third is a study and work program offered in Israel; students may choose between several alternatives. In the fourth, the Independent Study Program, students pursue a contemporary culture course or specialized topic in a large city and then engage in a work/service activity related to the study project.

The Institute for Off-Campus Experiences is one of the few organizations in the United States which has had operational experience in setting up service-learning programs overseas.

Narrow-Focus Programs

The second group within the category of programs sponsored by intermediary organizations comprises those with a narrow focus, either in geographical area or in activities of the participants.

Operation Crossroads Africa serves as a bridge between students who want a service-learning experience in Africa and village development projects which need workers. Though Crossroads Africa itself does not give credit for this service-learning experience, many institutions do grant their students credit for participating.

Volunteers in Asia (VIA) Program of Stanford University (California) gives students an opportunity to live, work, and learn in Indonesia, the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea, and Japan. Most students work as English teachers, but more are becoming involved in village technology, environmental impact studies, and rural health care. Students may receive credit, though most do not ask for it.

Those students working in village technology may carry out their assignments in association with BUTSI, the Indonesian domestic volunteer service. The BUTSI-VIA affiliation was the only example that this study found of cooperation between a domestic volunteer service program and a U.S. international service-learning program.

The Association Internationale des Etudiants en Sciences Economique et Commerciales (AIESEC) offers the Intern Exchange Program. Each position found for a foreign student in the local community allows a local student to apply for an internship at a firm in a foreign country.

The International Association for the Exchange of Students for Technical Experience (IAESTE) is similar to AIESEC except that it is not student-managed, it operates on a larger scale, and its participants are students of engineering, architecture, agriculture, and the sciences.

Other narrow-focus programs include the International Legal Exchange Program and Medical Assistance Programs-International.

Private-Sector Service-Organization Programs

The majority of international service programs in the private sector require a bachelor's degree for eligibility, and the trend is toward even more higher specialized and experienced candidates. Many of these programs are church-affiliated, and few recommend credit for participation.

The American Friends Service Committee places approximately 50 volunteers per year in all parts of the developing world for two-year assignments in technical assistance.

International Voluntary Services, Inc., provides technical assistance (mostly to African countries) in agriculture, rural

development, cooperatives, health and nutrition, education, engineering, and related fields.

LAOS, Inc., is an agency which matches concerned persons with church and other private projects in the U.S. and abroad.

International 4-H Youth Exchange (IFYE) Representative Program offers students the opportunity to live and work in another country. Some students arrange for university credit.

United Nations Volunteers help staff economic and social development projects in more than 30 countries.

Church-Related Volunteer Programs. Six church-related volunteer programs operate similarly to the programs described above.

Public-Sector Programs

Except for the Peace Corps, public-sector programs have not been extensively developed in the international area. Texas Southern University (Houston, Texas) has operated a Teacher Corps/Peace Corps Program since 1971. Students earn credit toward a Master of Education degree by teaching secondary school in Ghana or Sierra Leone.

Some attempt has been made recently to expand the University Year for Action (see pp.13-14) to include placement overseas. In 1976, the Peace Corps commissioned three studies to explore the feasibility of establishing service-learning programs in African countries. One of these reports, by Western Washington State College, concluded that setting up a short-term nontechnical service-learning program in any of the African countries visited would not be an advisable move at this time. For one thing, it would be very difficult to push a service-learning program of any scale upon an African government or institution. For another, such a program would take consider-

able time to arrange. Finally, it would be almost impossible to link up such a program with any of the national service programs that operate in some African countries because those programs tend to be highly nationalistic, if not chauvinistic, and some are even paramilitary in nature.

Given enough time and care, programs for placing American students in service-learning experiences in other countries might be developed unilaterally, and perhaps eventually, bilaterally. But this process should not be rushed.

Programs Involving a Reverse Flow

The Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) provides assistance to anyone working in the field of international education and student travel, sponsoring (in cooperation with other institutions and agencies) such programs as the Cooperative Study Centers, which offer overseas study opportunities to both undergraduate and graduate students. In 1969, under contract from the U.S. State Department, CIEE sponsored a summer work/travel activity whose purpose was to enable foreign university students to visit the United States during their summer vacation and pay for their visit by taking temporary employment during their stay in this country.

Volunteers to America, a program sponsored by the State Department that operated between 1967 and 1969, brought students from 12 foreign countries to the United States to share their knowledge and skills, just as Peace Corps volunteers go abroad. A total of 105 students came to work in VISTA and other community activities in public school systems.

Evaluation and Assessment of Service-Learning Experiences

In the case of those programs that give academic credit for participation, the individual institution is usually responsible for evaluating the experience and assigning an appropriate credit value. The most direct means has been to test the student's knowledge, and especially language proficiency, through written or oral examinations. Participants are often asked to keep journals or critical diaries, which are then submitted for faculty review, or to give written or oral reports. In some cases, the faculty advisor in residence in the host country makes an evaluation report. In other cases, a learning contract is prepared prior to the overseas experience and then reviewed and discussed after the experience. In still other cases, the student turns in a learning portfolio consisting of reports, film slides, and so forth.

The Educational Testing Service (Princeton, New Jersey), in cooperation with a consortium of colleges and universities, is currently trying to develop standard methods for assessing experiential learning. This project, the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning, has focused on four areas: (1) the assessment of interpersonal skills for academic credit; (2) the use of portfolios in assessing experiential learning; (3) the assessment of the learning outcomes of a work experience; and (4) the use of expert judgment in assessing learning outcomes. It is possible that this project will result in the development of a more standardized means of broadly assessing the variety of experiences covered by international service-learning programs.

Possible Courses of Action

In view of the findings reported here, what further steps should

be taken with respect to international service-learning programs? The purpose of this section is to present alternative courses of action.

1. The first course is to take no action at all that would in any way affect the initiatives of individual colleges and universities.

2. A grant program might be established--either through the Office of Education's Division of International Education or through ACTION--to foster the growth of existing international service-learning programs and to encourage the creation of new programs at the nation's colleges and universities, with the Goshen College program used as a principal model.

3. The most urgent need with respect to international service-learning programs is for some centralized source of information and coordination. The three organizations best suited to play such a role would seem to be the American Council on Education (which has access to academic institutions, education associations, and government agencies), the Council on International Education Exchange (which has a long history of involvement with overseas student programs), and the Institute for Off-Campus Experience at Northeastern University (which has had considerable experience operating work-service programs both at home and abroad). These three organizations might form a network, with ACE acting as the coordinator and CIEE and the Institute for Off-Campus Experience forming the base of an information system. The three could encourage and assist colleges and universities interested in developing service-learning programs. The network should, however, have an identity of its own and should also undertake the development of standardized techniques for assessing experiential learning for academic credit.

4. A separate organization might be established in Washington, outside the government but in close association with the higher education community. Its purpose would be to serve as a centralized source of information, to develop and coordinate programs, to assess credit, and to grant program funds.

5. Though ACTION, the Federal government might make a total effort to create and fund a new bilateral international service-learning program.

6. A new Federal youth agency--incorporating the elements of a national youth service, international service-learning, a reverse-flow program, and so forth--might be established

Recommendations

Derek Bok, President of Harvard posed the question: "In education, . . . how do we provide an adequate foundation to prepare undergraduates for a world in which they will have to understand and cope with other traditions and cultures?"

Certainly one answer is to offer students new opportunities to participate in international service-learning experiences.

It should be emphasized, however, that great care should be taken prior to any involvement in multilateral programs. Even in the area of unilateral programs, closer study is necessary; such programs must be built on a situation-to-situation basis.

Considerable care must also be taken to protect the initiatives of the nation's colleges and universities. The success or failure of international service-learning experiences will depend on the depth of commitment made by the institution itself, its faculty, and its students.

More time and attention should also be given to the problems connected with having any U.S. government agency directly responsible for operating such programs. The total objective might be met better if the higher education community fostered and coordinated such activities.

Of the possible courses of action outlined above, the most judicious would seem to be the approaches mentioned as alternatives 3 and 4. The choice between the two would depend upon the degree of centralization and coordination viewed as necessary and upon the availability of funds to support such an activity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACTION. Americans Volunteer - 1974. Washington: ACTION, 1975.
- ACTION. An Evaluation of the National Student Volunteer Program. Report written under contract to the American University. Washington: ACTION, 1975.
- ACTION. Impact of PLS on the Volunteer. Draft report prepared by Kappa Systems, Inc. Washington: ACTION, 1975.
- ACTION. Volunteer's Project Analysis Handbook. Washington: ACTION, [1976].
- American Council on Education, American Youth Commission. Youth and the Future. Washington: ACE, 1942.
- American Council on Education, Office on Educational Credit. Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services. Washington: ACE, 1976.
- American Council on Education, Office on Educational Credit, and the University of the State of New York, Project on Noncollege Sponsored Instruction. A Guide to Educational Programs in Non-collegiate Organizations. Washington: ACE, 1976.
- American Council on Education, Policy Analysis Service. Education and Work: Report of a Seminar. Policy Analysis Service Reports, Vol. 2, No. 1. Washington: ACE, 1976.
- Bailey, Stephen K. The Purposes of Education. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New Students and New Places. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Coleman, James S., et al. Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Report of the Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning. Implementing a Program for Assessing Experiential Learning. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

- Corwin, Thomas M., & Kent, Laura. "The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act: An Opportunity for Higher Education." Policy Briefs (Bulletin of the Policy Analysis Service of the American Council on Education), November 1977.
- Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Eberly, Donald J. National Service: Report of a Conference. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968.
- Eberly, Donald J. An Agenda for Off-Campus Learning Experiences. Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, 1969.
- Eberly, Donald J. A Model for Universal Youth Service. Paper prepared for the Universal Youth Service Conference sponsored by the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, Hyde Park, New York, April 9-10, 1976.
- Eberly, Donald J. Universal Youth Service Milestones. Paper prepared for the Universal Youth Service Conference sponsored by the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, Hyde Park, New York, April 9-10, 1976.
- Eberly, Donald J. "The Educational Integrity of Community Service and the Need for Federal Support." New Directions for Higher Education, 18, Summer 1977, pp. 53-63.
- Eberly, Donald J. "National Service: Alternative Strategies." Armed Forces and Society, May 1977, pp. 445-56.
- Edelstein, Fritz. A Guide to Operating an Off-Campus College Work-Study Program. Washington: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.
- Etzioni, Amitai "Public Affairs: The Case for a New Youth Conservation Corps." Human Behavior, August 1976.
- Gallagher, Dennis. New Prospects for Youth: Worlds of Education, Work and Service. Unpublished MS. Washington: American Council on Education, 1976.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Beyond the Open Door--The Open College." Community and Junior College Journal, August-September 1974, pp. 6-12.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "The Emergence of the Community College as a Center for Service-Learning." Synergist, Spring 1975, pp. 10-14.

Green, Thomas F. Work, Leisure and the American Schools. New York: Random House, 1968.

Guzzardi, Walter, Jr. "Education for the World of Work." Fortune, October 1975, pp. 124-28+.

Guzzardi, Walter, Jr. "The Uncertain Passage from College to Job." Fortune, January 1976, pp. 126-29+.

Hoyt, Kenneth. Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept. New York: Olympus, 1975.

Institute of International Education. Open Doors 1975: Report on International Education Exchange. New York: IIE, 1976.

Janowitz, Morris. The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Janowitz, Morris. Institution Building in Urban Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Janowitz, Morris. Sociology and the Military Establishment. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1974.

Janowitz, Morris, et al. The New Military: Changing Patterns of Organization. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Keniston, Kenneth. "Youth: A New Stage of Life." American Scholar, August 1970, pp. 631-54.

Kirschner Associates, Inc. Youth Challenge Program Evaluation Study: Final Report. Prepared for the Office of Policy and Planning, Evaluation Division, ACTION. Washington: Kirschner Associates, Inc., 1976.

Lifetime Learning Act, 1975. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. (First Session of S. 2497.) December 18, 1975.

- Marland, Sidney P., Jr. Career Education: A Proposal for Reform. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Marland, Sidney P., Jr. Essays in Career Education. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1973.
- McKee, Robert L., and Gaffney, Michael J. The Community Service Fellowship Planning Project: Final Report. Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.
- Mondale, Walter F. "The Next Step: Lifelong Learning." Change, October 1976, pp. 42-45.
- National Commission for Manpower Policy. From School to Work: Improving the Transition. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Newman, Frank, et al. Report on Higher Education. [The First Newman Report] Washington: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1971.
- Newman, Frank, et al., National Policy and Higher Education: Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. [The Second Newman Report] Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973.
- O'Toole, James. Work and the Quality of Life. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974.
- Rivlin, Alice M. Systematic Thinking for Social Action. Washington: Brookings Institution, 1971.
- Sansbury, David L., et al. Evaluation of University Year for ACTION: Executive Summary. Washington: School of Education, American University, 1975.
- Sexton, Robert F., and Stephenson, John B. "Institutionalizing Experiential Learning in a State University." In Implementing Field Experience Education, edited by John Duley. New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 2, No. 2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Summer 1974, pp. 55-65.
- Sexton, Robert F., and Ungerer, Richard A. Rationales for Experiential Education. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1975.

Sexton, Robert F., and Hofer, Barbara K., eds. Toward New Horizons for University Year for ACTION Service-Learning. Washington: National Center for Public Service Internship Programs, 1975.

Shelton, C. Kathryn, ed. Options for Learning: A Catalogue of Off-Campus Learning Opportunities in Kentucky. Lexington, Ky: University of Kentucky, n.d.

Terry, Mark. Teaching for Survival: A Handbook for Environmental Education. New York: Ballantine, 1971.

Timpane, Michael. Youth Policy in Transition. Prepared for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1976.

Trow, Martin. Reflections on Policies for Youth. Paper prepared for the Conference on Young People in Contemporary Industrial Society, Ditchley Park, England, October 1976.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation: Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education, FY 1975. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Vasquez Associates, Ltd. Summary of the Study of VISTA and UYA Volunteer Production. Prepared for the Evaluation Branch of ACTION. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Vasquez Associates, Ltd., 1974.

White House Conference on Youth. "Preamble." Recommendations and Resolutions. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Wholey, Joseph S., et al. Federal Evaluation Policy: Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs. Washington: Urban Institute, 1970.

Wilson, James W. Undergraduate Programs of Cooperative Education in the United States and Canada. Boston, Mass.: National Commission for Cooperative Education, 1976.

Wirtz, Willard, and the National Manpower Institute. The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education-Work Policy. Washington: New Republic, 1975.